



United States Patent and Trademark Office

	States Patent and Trademark Office
Address	COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	Michala, Vilginia 22313-1430

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,384 -,	10/26/2001	Antonius Hendricus Maria Holtslag	NL000547	4617
24737 7:	590 02/26/2004		EXAM	INER
PHILIPS INT P.O. BOX 3001	ELLECTUAL PROF	MENGISTU, AMARE		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2673	a
			DATÉ MAILED: 02/26/200	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
_	10/043,384	HOLTSLAG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Amare Mengistu	2673				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 Ja</u>	nnuary 2004.					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	,—					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	***	• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/043,384

Art Unit: 2673

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1,6-12,14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakabayashi et al (2003/0193449 A1) in view of Salters et al (2001/0040436).

As to claims 1,6-12,14,15, Wakabayashi et al (hereinafter Wakabayashi) discloses a sub-field driven display device (fig.1 (1a)) having a sub-field converter (fig. 1(8)) for converting video signals into sub-field data. Wakabayashi did not expressly detailed that the sub-field are weighted and duplicated for achieving a plurality of gray levels as a ternary distributed sub-field weights. However, the patent of Salters et al (hereinafter Salters) clearly teaches that the sub-field are weighted and duplicated for achieving a plurality of gray levels as a ternary distributed sub-field weights (see, page 5, [0031] and [0033] and alternate light output control patterns in predetermined units of the display (page 2 [0015]; check-board pattern).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the distribution of sub-field weight by duplicating the gray levels as taught by Salters into the display system of Wakabayashi because this will allow the Wakabayashi display to reduce flicker and provide a high quality image display.

Application/Control Number: 10/043,384

Art Unit: 2673

The way

3. Claims 2-5, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakabayashi et al in view of Salters et al as applied to claim*1,6-12,14-15 above, and further in view of Tajima et al (6,249,265 B1).

As to claims 2, **Wakabayashi** as modified by **Salters** discloses a ternary distribution of sub-field weights, but failed to teach the weight is symmetrically duplicated or the weights are increased at the center. The patent of **Tajima** teaches that the weight is symmetrically duplicated (see, figs. 36,39, and 40).

As to claims 3, 4, **Tajima** did not teaches that the weights are increased or highest sub-filed at the center of the distribution, but **Tajima** disclose increase or highest weight distribution of the sub-fields at the edges of sub-fields. It would obvious to one skill in the art to increase or highest weight distribution at the center.

As to claims 5, 13, **Tajima** did not expressly detailed the motion compensation means to enhance motion artifact reduction. However, **Tajima** duplicating sub-field method (see, figs. 36,39 and 40) will achieve a motion compensation to enhance the artifact the same way as the applicant.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-10, filed Jan.30,2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-15 under USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of **Salters et al** (2001/004036).

Art Unit: 2673

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amare Mengistu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4880.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, T-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Amare Mengistu Primary Examiner Page 4

Art Unit 2673

A.M

Feb.22,2004